



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,348	01/31/2002	David Yu Chang	AUS920010978US1	3450

7590 12/09/2005
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/062,348	Applicant(s) CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher J. Brown	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5, and 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 5, and 9 state “storing a plurality of keyfiles for different users in a data storage that is accessible only to a client computer”. The applicant states support for this can be found in figure 2. The examiner can find no support for the restrictive statement “accessible only to a client computer” from figure 2, especially since the keyfiles are sent to the server.

Claims 1, 5, and 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was

not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 5, and 9 state "opening only one of said keyfiles". The applicant states support for this can be found in page 12 lines 4-8. The examiner can find no support for the restrictive statement "only one". While the limitations on page 12 lines 4-8 do state opening "opening the users keyfile" there is no restricting line stating "only".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 5, and 9 recites the limitation "the specific user" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The statement "the specific user" appears to relate to the previously stated "for different users", however the connection between the two parties is not made entirely clear, thus the lack of antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrench JR. US 2002/0104025 in view of Sasaki US 6,378,071 in view of Schneier "Applied Cryptography".

As per claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 Wrench JR. teaches a system for establishing secure connection between a client and a server, [0017]. Wrench JR. teaches storing keyfiles comprised of private keys and certificates, [0004]. Wrench JR. teaches accessing the stored keyfiles via a password, [0028]. Wrench JR. teaches transmitting from client to server a digital certificate to perform authentication, [0004]. Wrench JR. teaches utilizing SSL, [0004].

Wrench JR does not teach the contents of the certificate. Wrench JR does not explicitly teach a plurality of different users.

Schneier teaches the definition of the standard X.509 certificate which includes a public key and the name of the authority that issued the public key, (page 574 Fig 24.2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Wrench JR with the X.509 certificate because it is widely used in public key cryptography.

As per claims Wrench JR. teaches using a password to access stored data, but failed to teach a unique identifier.

Sasaki teaches accessing securely stored information with both a unique identifier and a password, wherein the authentication unit determines if the user is one of a set of registered users, (Col 5 lines 38-46). Sasaki teaches accessing the stored encrypted data upon authentication, (Col 6 lines 30-43). Sasaki teaches the data stored in external storage is only accessible to the client, (Col 5 lines 40-45, Fig 3).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the unique identifier password and encryption of Sasaki with the keyfile of Wrench JR. because the addition of the authentication increases security.

As per claims 4, 8, and 12, Wrench JR. teaches utilizing a GUI for interacting with the system, [0027].

Claims 3, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wrench JR. US 2002/0104025 in view of Sasaki US 6,378,071 in view of Schneier "Applied Cryptography" in view of Norris US 2002/0095568.

As per claims 3, 7, and 11, the previous Wrench JR-Sasaki-Schneier combination teaches authentication but fails to teach digital signatures.

Norris teaches the use of digital signatures (hashing) with physical tokens, to perform an adapted method of SSL authentication, [0091].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the authentication method of Norris with the system of Wrench JR-Sasaki-Schneier because the physical token adds an extra layer of security.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Maurin US 2002/0133700 teaches certificates, their components and sending them via a secure SSL connection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2134


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

11/28/05


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100